



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

k

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/914,886	01/07/2002	Per Sandberg	OUTO 2326	6087

7812 7590 10/03/2003

SMITH-HILL AND BEDELL  
12670 N W BARNES ROAD  
SUITE 104  
PORTLAND, OR 97229

EXAMINER

LEO, LEONARD R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3743

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2003

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/914,886

Applicant(s)

SANDBERG, PER

Examiner

Leonard R. Leo

Art Unit

3743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 6, 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 10-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,11 and 22-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,10 and 12-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 06 May 2003 is: a) ☐ approved b) ☒ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 3743

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The amendment filed May 6, 2003 has been entered. Claims 1-2 and 10-26 are pending, and claims 2, 11 and 22-26 are withdrawn.

#### ***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "cooling element forms a substantially equal angle (B) to the longitudinal direction of the circulating element as the louvers form to the surface (C) of the cooling element" in claim 1 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

In the proposed Figure 3b filed May 6, 2003, the angle (B) is not substantially equal the angle (C).

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 3743

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 10, 16-17, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 48-27263 (JP).

In the anticipatory rejection, JP (Figures 6-7) discloses the acute angle of the louvers with respect to the fin and the acute angle of the fin with respect to the airflow are substantially equal.

In the obviousness rejection, one of ordinary skill in the art would employ any desired angles to achieve a desired heat exchange and/or pressure drop. Any increased angle relative to the airflow increases the pressure drop and the heat exchange.

Claims 12-15, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 48-27263 (JP) in view of Applicant's admission.

The device of JP lacks the cooling element composed of copper.

Applicant's admission (page 1, second paragraph) discloses corrugated fin strips are composed of copper, copper-based alloy, aluminum or aluminum-based alloy.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to employ in JP corrugated fin strips composed of copper for the purpose of achieving a desired heat exchange as recognized by Applicant's admission. Further, it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

### ***Response to Arguments***

The proposed drawings correction to Figures 1-2 is approved.

The rejection in view of Itoh et al is withdrawn.

Regarding applicant's remarks with respect to JP 48-27263 (JP), the claims do not recite where the "longitudinal direction" of the circulating element is oriented relative to the circulating element(s). In Figure 6 of JP, the "airflow direction" is read as the "longitudinal direction" of the circulating element 1, where the louver angle  $\beta$  is substantially equal to the angle  $(90 - B)$  of the cooling element 3.

In the obviousness rejection, the selection of the angles of the louvers and fins is an obvious design choice, producing no new and/or unexpected results. One of ordinary skill in the art recognizes an increase in pressure drop increases the heat transfer, though at a cost to the pumping power. The speed of the airflow is irrelevant, since the angles of the louvers and fins will always present a flow obstruction producing turbulent flow. As best understood, the instant invention is not merely substantially equal angled fins and louvers, rather the combination of the louvers being parallel to the airflow direction *and* being substantially equal angled to the fin.

The rejection in view of applicant's admission is deemed correct for lack of any arguments by applicant.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 3743

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry of a general nature, relating to the status of this application or clerical nature (i.e. missing or incomplete references, missing or incomplete Office actions or forms) should be directed to the Technology Center 3700 Customer Service whose telephone number is (703) 306-5648. Status of the application may also be obtained from the Internet: <http://pair.uspto.gov/cgi-bin/final/home.pl>

Any inquiry concerning this Office action should be directed to Leonard R. Leo whose telephone number is (703) 308-2611.



LEONARD R. LEO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 3743

October 1, 2003